

REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the final Office Action mailed on December 31, 2007. A Request for Continued Examination (RCE) is submitted herewith. The Director is authorized to charge \$810 for the RCE and any additional fees which may be required, or to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-1818. If such a withdrawal is made, please indicate the Attorney Docket No. 112857-188 on the account statement.

Claims 44-59 are pending in this application. Claims 1-43 were previously cancelled. In the Office Action, Claim 51 is objected to, Claims 44-48, 50-56 and 58-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 and Claims 49 and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103. In response, Claims 44 and 50-52 have been amended and Claims 60-63 have been added. The amendment does not add new matter. In view of the amendment and/or for the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections are improper and should be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, Claim 51 is objected to. In response, Claims 50 and 51 have been amended to address the informalities cited by the Patent Office. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the claims be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, Claims 44-48, 50-56 and 58-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2002/0075319 to Hochmuth ("*Hochmuth*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reasons set forth below.

Independent Claims 44 and 52 have been amended to recite, in part, transmitting the time information, wherein the time information for any of the application programs is changed when a user operation changes displayed application data. The amendment as discussed above is fully supported in the specification. For example, when the application is an image browser, the "time of application" is changed when the image file displayed on the screen is changed by user operation. See, specification, paragraph [0136]. In another example, when the application is an electronic mail browser, the "time of application" is changed when the mail being displayed on the screen is changed by an operation by the user. See, specification, paragraph [0142]. In a further example, when the application is a memo system, the "time of application" is changed when the memo data being displayed on the screen is changed by the operation by the user. See, specification, paragraph [0145]. The time of application in each application may differ for each

type of application according to what was being performed at that time or to what the application was doing at that time. See, specification, paragraph [0133].

In contrast, Applicants respectfully submit that *Hochmuth* fails to disclose or suggest every element of Claims 44 and 52 as amended. *Hochmuth* does not disclose an apparatus or method where the time information for any of the application programs is changed when a user operation changes displayed application data, as currently claimed. Rather, the emphasis of *Hochmuth* is directed to monitoring when or how often an icon related to an application program is accessed. See, *Hochmuth*, paragraphs [0021-0023]. A log monitors such access to the icons to and records time stamps. If that particular file has been accessed by the user through the GUI more than a specified threshold number of times within a specified period, it meets the criteria for creating a shortcut. See, *Hochmuth*, paragraph [0029]. Time stamps in *Hochmuth* merely provide a time period in which the computer counts the number of accesses to a file or application program.

Applicants respectfully submit that the time stamps in *Hochmuth* do not correspond with user operated changes to the application data, as currently claimed. Instead, *Hochmuth* discloses that to edit a file, such action involves some type of file access. See, *Hochmuth*, paragraph [0022]. In *Hochmuth*, it is the time at which the file is accessed by user interaction which is ultimately logged, rather than the time at which the file is changed or edited by the user. See, *Hochmuth*, paragraph [0023], lines 1-3 (emphasis added). In other words, the time information in *Hochmuth* does not correspond to a change to the data by the user, as currently claimed.

In contrast, the time information can correspond to a change to the data by the user as embodied by the claimed invention and illustrated in the specification. When the document file is changed, the contents of the file at the time it is changed are stored. See, specification, paragraph [0108]. Further, as defined in new Claims 60 and 62, version information of the application data can be stored with the time information when the user changes the application data. See, specification, paragraph [0119]. As further defined in new Claims 61 and 63, the difference between the previous file and the changed file can be stored with the time information when the user changes the application data. See, specification, paragraph [0120]. Applicants respectfully submit that the subject matter as newly defined in the added claims is patentable

over the cited art of record for at least the same reasons as discussed above, and for the additional patentable elements recited therein.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the obviousness rejection with respect to Claims 44-48, 50-56 and 58-59 be reconsidered and the rejection be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, Claims 49 and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hochmuth* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,633,924 to Wu et al. ("*Wu*"). However, *Wu* fails to cure the deficiencies in *Hochmuth*. Applicants respectfully submit that the patentability of Claims 44 and 52 as previously discussed renders moot the obviousness rejection of Claims 49 and 57 that depend therefrom. In this regard, the cited art fails to teach or suggest all of the elements of Claims 49 and 57 in combination with the novel elements of Claims 49 and 57.


Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the obviousness rejection with respect to Claims 49 and 57 be reconsidered and the rejection be withdrawn.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above-identified patent application and earnestly solicit an early allowance of same.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLP

BY



Thomas C. Basso
Reg. No. 46,541
Customer No. 29175

Dated: March 5, 2008